1	I have that I'd like to talk about but really - well,
2	for example, let me just go down a few of these things.
3	What are the - are the poles - I have a
4	pole in front of my house. It's got a streetlight and
5	it's got electricity that comes into the house and it's
6	got a cable that comes into the house. It's a wooden
7	pole. It's an old wooden pole of the type that they
8	put up in the 30's. They replaced it, I think, but
9	anyway.
10	Is that the kind of pole that we're talking
11	about or is it something more exotic than that?
12	MR. LANGLEY: No, that's it.
13	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: That's
14	it. Just very simply plain, okay, all right.
15	Okay, and you say that besides - you do
16	have utility wires on this obviously. You've got the
17	cable wires on these poles and then you have other
18	types of wires. Is that correct, telecommunication
19	wires?
20	MR. LANGLEY: Yes, Your Honor. Usually like
21	in Gulf Power's case, a joint user, like an ILEC,
22	Bellsouth, and our case, GTC, Sprint.

1	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay,
2	all right, so I don't need to get into that but there
3	are different rates that are authorized to be charged
4	for telecommunication services versus cable services.
5	Both of you agree with that, right? I mean
6	you're not - I'm not asking for the wisdom of that, but
7	that's a fact of life.
8	MR. LANGLEY: Yes, Your Honor.
9	MR. SEIVER: Yes, Your Honor.
10	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
11	The area is all in southern Florida?
12	MR. LANGLEY: No actually, it's in Northwest
13	Florida. Our territory runs roughly from the Alabama-
14	Florida line near Pensacola, over towards Tallahassee,
15	I think it's Bay County, the furthest
16	MR. SEIVER: Bay County.
17	MR. LANGLEY: Which is where Panama City is.
18	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: So it's
19	more Northern Florida?
20	MR. PETERSON: Panhandle area.
21	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay,
22	nothing important about that, but I'm just trying to

1 get a vision of what's going on here. 2 MR. LANGLEY: Your Honor, may I add one 3 thing. There actually is something important about 4 5 that. That's one of the reasons that there's been 6 That is that a substantial part of our delay here. 7 network was wiped out in mid-September by Hurricane Ivan. What relevance that has on this proceeding, I'm 8 9 not sure, other than the delay but --10 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: That's 11 why we're having this pre-hearing conference a bit late 12 was to accommodate that as best I could. I understand 13 that and I really do empathize with the folks, you folks, down there that - what you've gone through. 14 That horrible stuff. 1.5 Okay, that's - those are just miscellaneous 16 17 things. 18 I'm going to just go right into the dates 19 because I'm a little bit - I'm still of the mind that you know a lot about this case already with the two 20 21 years that it's been back and forth between the two 22 parties.

1 Although, I don't that your dates are I would like to unreasonable. I'm not saying that. 2 try and compress things a little bit. 3 Now, before I say that, before I go down -4 to the down and dirty dates, do you have - I'm asking 5 Does your client have a you this Mr. Langley? 6 computerized system where maybe a software program or 7 some kind of a program, where you can identify each and 8 every pole in your system that has a wire that's on 9 there - a cable that's on there by the complainants? 10 Can you do that? 11 MR. PETERSON: The answer is no. 12 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: No? 13 Well, what kind of a system - how do you - what kind of 14 an accounting system do you have then for your poles? 15 The records system, I MR. PETERSON: 16 wouldn't call it necessarily an accounting system. 17 do have accounting for purposes of when the permitting 18 is undertaken and the charges are in there for the 19 counts. 20 As for the actual attachments and what's on 21 there we - everything that is mechanical will be paper. 22

1	With any, from the initial
2	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: It's
3	all hard copy?
4	MR. PETERSON: It's all hard copy and in
5	the different divisions throughout the panhandle.
6	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: All
7	right, now in the course of this litigation, going back
8	to two years ago or whatnot. Has there been anything
9	done to corral the information in those and relate them
10	to this - to these particular - this particular party
11	here, being a conglomerate of cable companies?
12	MR. PETERSON: The answer - I think the
13	broad answer to that to - for purposes all easy
14	discovery here is no.
15	There have been some over billed situations
16	like Mr. Seiver talked about Knology. He came in and
17	over billed on some of the party's poles here in the
18	Bay County, Panama City area.
19	Those sort of things and there's records
20	there that are readily available and we're examining
21	our matters regarding Knology.

As for over this two-year period, we've

1	been in kind of a stayed period and also as we've
2	talked about this is a matter of first impression
3	because we now have a new standard where these - this
4	type of information now becomes relevant by Judge
5	Tjoflat's decision.
6	So the compilation both, I believe, even
7	from the cable companies and us - I don't believe it's
8	readily accessible on a computer, either by them or us.
9	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: What -
10	I'm sorry I didn't mean to cut you off before you
11	finish. What would be the burden imposed upon you if
12	I were to require that you make a determination on a
13	pole by pole basis as to exactly what pole - well, it
14	would be broken down something like this.
15	Identify each and every pole which has a
16	cable attachment by one or several of any of the
17	complainant's parties and then two, describe what else
18	is on each of those poles?
19	MR. PETERSON: What in being - that was the
20	question that I asked my staff when we first got this
21	Order several months ago.

The answer is this, number one, we would be

able to identify from charts, generally what poles that we know have an attachment on there but they're not that accurate. So therefore, in order to get accurate information per pole, it would require staff - personnel actually going back into each division's records and reviewing each record and each pole permit to identify - take physically the papers, find the number for that pole, and go and jot down that information.

Then as for what's existing on the poles, or what was on the poles, it would require pole survey. Physically going out, taking pictures, looking at each of the poles in the whole service area.

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, if I were to say to you that that I'm sympathetic to your position that that you're entitled to the extra compensation under the 11th Circuit standard. I can't figure out - I can't get to that number unless you hire a consultant firm to get these poles pinned down one-by-one.

Would that be in your interest to consider doing that?

1	I mean, this is a big job. Let me just
2	footnote that a bit. I understand that you don't take
3	an existing team of workers that are doing things on a
4	day to day basis and you say, okay, just stop all that
5	and we're going to go over and we're going do this
6	thing that this Judge ruled - remain unnamed, up in
7	Washington wants us to do.
8	What about going out and hiring a
9	consultant firm? It does not sound the way consulting
10	firms go into companies these days that this is
11	something that would be too difficult for them to take
12	on.
13	MR. PETERSON: That is a possibility.
14	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Would
15	you consider doing that?
16	MR. PETERSON: That is a distinct
17	possibility. We would have - we would consider it and
18	we'll go back to the client and suggest that to them.
19	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Because
20	it also seems to me - and I'm not operating - I'm in -
21	I have no business judgment whatsoever, so don't take
22	it in that sense but if you - if what Mr. Langley, I am

1	certain Mr. Langley was telling it as it is. You would
2	have X number of poles out there that you don't really
3	even know what the heck is on them.
4	That would make sense to try and find that
5	out from a business standpoint. Particularly in light
6	of the fact that we're getting into this business of
7	you know, the 11 th Circuit/whatever.
8	MR. PETERSON: We don't readily - we do not
9	- we are not able to readily know what's on them right
10	now. Of course, this is a whole new world with the new
11	11th Circuit decision as to what you now need to do to
12	account.
13	That's where are and of course we're in the
14	process here of looking at that. I think the
15	consultant suggestion is a good suggestion and
16	something we can bring back to our client.
17	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay,
18	well you appreciate where I'm coming from.
19	MR. PETERSON: Yes sir absolutely.
20	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Because
21	if you got these now. You're charging, I mean, you're
22	doing what seems to me is the most reasonable thing to

1 do under the circumstances. 2 You're charging them the low end of the 3 scale - of the potential scale, you're charging them now. You may not agree with that, Mr. Seiver, but when 4 5 your talking about \$4.00 to \$5.00 a pole - that, in the 6 old English, that does not shock the conscience of the 7 Court. It's when you get into the \$30.00, \$40.00 8 9 range, that I start thinking seriously about it. You're riding on a pretty acceptable deal 10 The question is when you It seems to me. 11 right now. start moving beyond that based on this 11th Circuit 12 holding that the problems really start to be created. 13 So, if we can identify the universe of what 14 we're dealing with, it would accommodate two things. 15 First of all, it would put the record in 16 the position where - a reasonable position where I 17 could make a decision if it comes to that and secondly, 18 it might induce settlement. 19 I mean if you can show the other side that 20 you have got hard evidence or evidence which is 21

reliable and it's persuasive, I think that reasonable

86 1 parties accept that and say that well, maybe we ought to cut this thing now and not let the thing wander 2 3 around in the system for X numbers of months or years. 4 MR. PETERSON: One of the other things we're considering too, also, and since we're in the 5 6 litigation and working this sort of thing. Ιs 7 obtaining what information the cable companies have as to their putting on those attachments. 8

The information as to what they indicate that they have and the time frames and those sort of So, we would expect that there be some things too. documentation - we don't believe, based on talking actually with some of the staff of the company's operationally, that they have the computer system or accounting all of that information, or GPS system that would indicate where their attachments are.

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: we could ask Mr. Seiver. I make this always of the mind that discovery you come to a two way street.

The distinction that I'm making here this morning, however, is that you all have the burden of You all being Gulf Power. So you, in a sense,

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have to go first. 1 Yes, sir. 2 MR. PETERSON: CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: 3 4 other - however, with respect to discovery, there is would expect that there be 5 the overlap and I simultaneously was exchanged. 6 your schedule Ι think this is what 7 contemplates for anyway. 8 That's correct, sir. MR. PETERSON: 9 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: It. 10 sounds like as far as your approach is concerned that 11 you got a meeting of the minds there. 12 All right, well, now, the question is how 13 much urgency can I put on this request that I made of 14 I'm going to set these dates I don't know. 15 you. anyway, but I'm going to be pushing on that. 16 I can tell you this and you can go back and tell your 17 clients if they don't come up with something of the 18 nature that I'm talking about this is going to be - and 19 this - and both parties are serious about litigating 2.0 this to the end. 21

This is going to be - this can get into

becoming a very unpleasant situation. Just by virtue of the nature of the evidence as I see it and what is going to be contested every inch of the way.

But if you can give me something that I can be convinced of as a reliable, in effect a study of your poles. Because this case is all about poles. That's all this case is really about.

Once we get the pole issue resolved which means a - yes, a working definition of what does it mean to have a fully occupied pole and the other things, all those ramifications.

Once we get the poles, once we get - or I'm satisfied that there is a way of addressing that, then these other questions of what is a reasonable measure of damages in light of the fact, and as I'm telling you and you can relay this again to your client that this is a charge that's being assessed in a market that is not a market.

Where you do have - I'm accepting the fact that you do have a form of monopoly power. So that your measure of damages has to be a bit creative in terms of taking that into account.

1	Having said all that, it still goes back,
2	as far as I can see it, it's all the poles. Once we
3	get the poles under control, everything else will flow
4	from that and it will be relatively clear sailing.
5	Although I do suspect that if this goes all
6	the way to a decision there will be one party in this
7	courtroom that I doesn't like the way I did it.
8 1	That's the way it goes. At least we'll get
9	to the end of it in an amicable way, I think.
10	All right, when can you tell me? When can
11	you tell me? I'm leaving the country to visit
12	grandchildren in Germany on the 21^{st} of December and I
13	won't be back until the 5 th of January.
14	So, give me a status report - I'll give you
15	a date certain. Sometime in the second week of
16	January?
17	MR. PETERSON: That will be fine, Your
18	Honor.
19	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay,
20	let me give you a date. I will - let me say, well, the
21	second week, that's - let me give it to you - let me
22	say January 11 th , because the first week of January is

really only one day. So January 11th.

For here, I am going to call it a status report now. I intend to get an Order out on that in the next day or so on that specific thing so that you will have a piece of paper to also talk to your board or executive people about. Don't feel constrained by it.

In other words, I'm looking for a product, which is the best product that you can produce. I'm not trying to design the product myself. It has to account for poles. In some way, shape or form it has to account for poles on an individual basis and what is on those poles.

In the first place - the first start would be - only the poles that pertain to these particular clients. It doesn't mean your whole system.

If you want to do your whole system, be my guest. I'm requiring only that the - only the poles that are an issue in this case which are the ones that Mr. Seiver's clients are attached to.

Okay, I would also require - I will be requiring in addition to what the physical part of

2 development - any other development of those poles. 3 Now that does not have to be - you may want a consultant to do that for you or you may want to do 4 5 that independently of the consultant. At some point in time, you're going to have to come up with that. 6 7 has to be a reasonable period of time you're going to have to come up with that information. 8 9 In other words, you must have plans that are in existence - every corporation has planning 10 They love planning documents. So, I'm 11 documents. 12 assuming that Gulf Power has them, too. 13 MR. PETERSON: They do. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Ιf 14 15 they're broad and they're irrelevant by either standards or the other - you know Mr. Seiver, if the 16 going to arque that they're 17 complainants are Fine, that can be the case. 18 irrelevant. The point is that whatever you have, I want 19 to get out on the table and have everybody look at it. 20 Okay. Not me personally but have the other 2.1 22 side look at it. What I intend to do is when this

what's there, is any plans that you have for the

element gets pulled together in some way would be to have another - would be to require some kind of filings on this and have another pre hearing conference to be sure that I can see where this thing is going.

Because if we can get this thing narrowed on an evidentiary basis this thing is - we'll be able to try this case without, I think, without too much trouble.

I may regret I said that but anyway.

So, what I'm going to do is - now, I'm going to require also - so in addition to - let me make sure I'm keeping track of this. In addition to a report back on - I'm going to generically call it a consultant's report.

If that is the willingness of the company to go along with that. You're also going to turn over at that time all existing planning documents with respect to the complainant's poles. I am going to call them the complainant's poles now. Again if you've got the planning documents that pertain to all of the poles that are in your system and there is a way that you can either delete or somehow or other or pull out the other

2.1

part because you got business reasons why you don't 1 want to disclose that at least in this first round, 2 that's all well and good. On the other hand, if you 3 want to give them everything, that's even better. 4 5 I'm going to use that same date and again, it's what's there. It's what's in - you open the file б cabinet, you look in you say, oh, here they are and you 7 just deliver them. That's all you need to do. 8 MR. LANGLEY: Your Honor, the parties can 9 meet jointly with a proposed protective order before 10 that. Would you be willing to entertain it? It might 11 12 ease the --CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: 13 yes. I could - you're going to have to get to me before 14 next Monday. You have to get it to me either the end 15 of this week or wait until I get back. 16 That will be the first week in January. 17 Am I looking at the right year? 18 MR. SEIVER: Just to help out on that, Your 19 Honor, we would agree to maintain anything we got 20 confidentiality until you have, Your Honor had the 21 opportunity to sign anything. 22 So

1	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank
2	you. Thank you.
3	See what I'm talking about. This is what
4	I'm talking about. January 11 th . Just go in and pull
5	out everything that you can. Give it to Mr. Seiver.
6	Mr. Seiver I'm going to ask you to do the
7	same thing. Everything that you have with respect to
8	these poles, that relate to the subject that we're
9	talking about here. I don't think that I have to go
10	and delineate that here.
11	I don't know why - I don't know. I don't
12	see why they would have to come up with any planning
13	documents because the planning documents - how can you
14	plan for somebody else's pole?
15	I mean you really just want to really know
16	what they have that's first hand - essentially first
17	hand knowledge of what's with the poles as far as their
18	concerned.
19	MR. LANGLEY: Unless they're planning to
20	build their own pole network in which case we would
21	like to know that.
22	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Well -

www.nealrgross.com

1 I don't think you're going to get that here. Your Honor, I'm sorry, Your MR. SEIVER: 2 Honor, just so I understand. 3 I mean they've invoiced us - they have all 4 the invoices and what's gone back and forth. I'm 5 presuming then anything that we have that shows a map 6 or something of our facilities. 7 Is that what --8 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: 9 kind of a cumulative report. 10 I'm not going to require it - I mean, I'm 11 sure in discovery they're going to get this. I don't -12 I mean this is a relatively quick turn around. 13 I don't know how you have a - some kind of a document. 14 you do it, either in chart form or something that has 15 an accounting system within your organization. 16 Well, you have to go actually down to the 17 five cable companies. In terms of what do they have on 18 Gulf Power's system? 19 No matter how minimal that information 20 might be, no matter how extensive that information 21 might be, but anything that bears on - I mean you know 22

1 where we're going on this. 2 We're trying to determine what's on each of 3 the poles in the system. Anything that you have to add 4 to that they're entitled to get. 5 You know they're going to get it eventually 6 if they qot to through depositions and qo 7 interrogatories, and everything like that. I'm trying to short circuit as much of that as I can. 8 9 So, I'm leaving it to you. Again, you are 10 also are to report back on January 11th. What's going 11 on from your standpoint in that respect? You're either 12 in the process of doing it or something is being put 13 together. 14 I take it that you don't know anymore than I'm asking. Is that right? I don't really know. 15 MR. SEIVER: I have no idea and the only 16 17 other concern I have is since this was related back to the 2000, 2001 timeframe of our complaint is Your Honor 18 wanted historical documents. 19 That's easier to at least determine whether 20 we have them or not as opposed to something that's 21 22 current.

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: I think 1 we ought to stay with - unless the Bureau's got it - if 2 you've got a different view on this, but I think for 3 the time being anyway, that the period that's alleged 4 5 that's the subject matter of this hearing order designation is that defined period in the 2000 - 2001 6 7 timeframe. MR. LANGLEY: Well, Your Honor-8 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: 9

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: Now go ahead, you tell - go ahead --

MR. LANGLEY: We do have a slightly different position on that. The evidence that we described in our description of evidence, which is what spring boarded us into this forum here had a broader temporal scope than that.

In fact, went as far forward as 2003, I believe. The hearing designation order says that Gulf Power should have an opportunity to produce the evidence described in its submission, which goes into 2003. Beyond that, I don't think that they're here just saying that the only thing that we're trying to hold on to for the cable rate is these poles during this narrow

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	period of time.
2	I think their mission is broader and
3	certainly, ours is also.
4	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: All
5	right, well, why don't you do this? Why don't you all
6	then agree to the time frame? You all figure it out
7	yourselves then.
8	I agree with what you say specifically
9	about - that's true. You are bound to put on proof
10	based on the four corners of that document that you
11	submitted in response to the Bureau's last ruling.
12	So, at a minimum that's required. So, any
13	date that would apply there.
14	You all agree to a date that's as far out
15	as you want to take it.
16	I very much - I expect that you're all
17	going to do this in a way that's going to put this case
18	in a position where all the issues can be resolved.
19	I mean I don't want to resolve this thing
20	half way. So - Okay.
21	Okay, that's - so you've got two things.
22	The consultants - the report back on whether or not a

consultants report is feasible and willing to be done. 1 2 Then secondly, the existing planning documents with respect to the complainant's poles. 3 That's for cable - that's for Gulf Power. 4 Then for Mr. Seiver's clients, it would be 5 something like - comprehensive documents with respect 6 to each cable company and the attachment of - the 7 8 attachment procedures for each pole. 9 Something of that nature. I'll - I think I can do this in such a way 10 that you'll get the jest of what I'm looking for and I 11 have to rely on your good faith that you're going to go 12 after that information and exchange it. 13 Then preliminary - I'll issue a preliminary 14 confidentiality requirement. Again, you'll also have 15 the discretion to pull off any documents that relate to 16 or exclude any documents that relate to other business 17 18 arrangements. Although at some point, you'll probably -19 you'll have to somehow or other identify or account for 20 what it is that you've excluded. For these purposes 21 now, I don't think that you need to do that. 22

1	You're just going to - each of you are
2	going to respectively tell the other party with a cover
3	letter or something, okay, here are the documents that
4	were given to you pursuant to the Judge's Order dated
5	such and such. Okay.
6	We're recognizing that that's just the
7	beginning.
8	MR. SEIVER: Your Honor, in addition to the
9	status report, would the Court like copies of whatever
10	it is that we exchange?
11	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: No. I
12	really don't.
13	MR. SEIVER: All right. I'll spare you.
14	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: If -
15	well, it's not a question of sparing me, it's not going
16	to do me any good. I mean, it's just not going to do
17	me any good.
18	You're going to have to explain to me,
19	based on what you tell me I'd be inclined to set up
20	another pre-hearing conference and have you really
21	explain to me - at some point in time, I'm obviously
22	going to see that.

1 This might just be the beginning of I don't know, I can't tell sitting 2 something more. here what it is that's going to happen with this. 3 I'm going to use that January 11th as being 4 a pivotal date and then from there, I'm going to set 5 6 off dates starting 30 days from January 11th to start 7 normal discovery procedure, i.e., vour serving interrogatories. 8 9 In other words, your interrogatories that you are going to serve 30 days from thence would 10 hopefully be based in part on what you're going to get 11 12 on the 11th of January. So, I mean I'm thinking this is going to 13 already have maybe your standard 14 help. You interrogatories that you're going to ask anyway. 15 should help sharpen what it is that you're going to be 16 17 asking for. Then I'll just - I'll just go down the 18 dates that you've given me and the tasks that you've 19 given me on your joint proposed schedule and I'll just 20 set the dates. 21

Try and keep things in a spaced out, as you

1	have done it, to the extent that I can. Some of the
2	dates you may not agree with and I really don't - I
3	really would like very much to see this case be set
4	down for trial.
5	I intend to do it really - to set a trial
6	date in early February 2006.
7	I appreciate everything that you've done
8	and why you're setting dates to allow for a lot of
9	things that maybe even I can't anticipate, but although
10	this is a very complex complicated case, at least I
11	think it is.
12	I still think that we got the resources
13	here to get this thing to trial by next February. I
14	set the dates and you either live by them or complain
15	about them.
16	Anybody have anything more?
17	MR. SEIVER: Very briefly, Your Honor.
18	This has been very helpful and I think that perhaps
19	maybe if we had another conference after the 11 th , but
20	before everything starts really rolling along, if the
21	other side would be interested in that.

We could have maybe formed better - I'm

1	hoping that we have - that our status report will say,
2	here's our documents. I don't know yet whether we'll
3	have that. I'm not sure whether Gulf Power will
4	actually have documents to attach.
5	If they're going to be saying we've got a
6	consultant, well, consider doing this.
7	I thought perhaps once we got passed that
8	filing of the 11 th , that if we had another pre-hearing
9	conference, then we might be able to say, well, this is
10	where we can shorten time. This is where we might need
11	longer time and benefit Your Honor's procedural
12	schedule that way.
13	MR. LANGLEY: Gulf Power is open to that.
14	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: You
15	would be
16	MR. LANGLEY: Yes.
17	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: All
18	right, well, let me just send – you will have
19	everything for 24 hours, well, I'll make it by Friday.
20	By Friday, January 14 th , then it can be - if
21	you both do it together - if you're both interested to
22	file it jointly.

1	If not, whoever is interested in having a
2	pre-hearing conference. Requesting a conference,
3	requesting a date, before the end of January, that's
4	convenient to you all and giving me an agenda, what it
5	is that you'd like to discuss.
6	Then I'll add my own from there.
7	It may very well be when you give me the
8	status report, I mean, I may be asking for documents or
9	something specific.
10	I think for the beginning part, I don't see
11	any point in giving me what it is that you're going to
12	explain to me in the pre-hearing conference anyway.
13	If either party feels constrained that I
14	should see what it is, I - you could, ask leave to
15	submit it.
16	I'm not trying to just cut this off
17	completely, but I just get the feeling that I'm going
18	to learn about it certainly before February 2006. I
19	don't need to jump into it that fast, I don't think.
20	We'll see.
21	How about the Bureau? Mr. Shook anything
22	that's

1	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, what I have in mind
2	is simply to talk to the parties after we're off the
3	record and after you have left, to go over some ideas
4	perhaps of how to short-circuit this.
5	I don't think what I have in mind is really
6	meant to alter what you have done to this point.
7	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: All
8	right, well, I take it that the Bureau doesn't - I
9	mean, you don't have any objections as to the way this
10	is preceding thus far.
11	MR. SHOOK: No. No.
12	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE SIPPEL: All
13	right, that's fine. I don't want to leave anybody
14	unhappy. Okay, we are in recess then until then the
15	pre-hearing conference and I will await your filings on
16	the 11 th of January and I will get an Order out by
17	sometime by tomorrow, certainly you will have an email,
18	again, just repeating everything that we've done here
19	on this January 11 th date.
20	Thank you, very much.
21	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
22	off the record at 11:19 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER

FLORIDA CABLE TELECO	DMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION, INC., ET AL.
Name of Hearing	
EB DOCKET NO. 04-383	1
Docket No. (if appl:	icable)
445 12 th STREET, S.W	., WASHINGTON, D.C.
Place of Hearing	
DECEMBER 13, 2004	
Date of Hearing	
numbers 1 through 10 transcript prepared John Mongover the above identified provisions of the corporessional verbate and have verified the (1) comparing the transcript accomplish proofed typewritten	do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, 05, inclusive, are the true, accurate and complete from the reporting by (Reporter's Name) in attendance at d hearing, in accordance with applicable urrent Federal Communications Commission's im reporting and transcription statement of Work he accuracy of the accuracy of the transcript by ypewritten transcript against the reporting or hed at the hearings and (2) comparing the final transcript against the reporting or recording hearing or conference.
	() Hur
Date	Legible Name and Signat Re of Reporter Name of Company:Neal Gross Co
December 23, 2004	Elizabeth Carter Editer
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Transcriber Name of Company:Neal Gross Co.
December 23, 2004	Kevin Murphy
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Propfreader Name of Company: Neal Gross Co.